

Date: Fri, 3 Jun 94 04:30:14 PDT  
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>  
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu  
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu  
Precedence: Bulk  
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V94 #235  
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest                      Fri, 3 Jun 94                      Volume 94 : Issue 235

Today's Topics:

ARRL Replies to proposed rules on Vanity Calls  
Coordination  
Legal Protections for Hams

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>  
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>  
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available  
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text  
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official  
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

-----  
Date: Thu, 02 Jun 94 20:18:23 EDT  
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!  
ns.mcs.kent.edu!kira.cc.uakron.edu!malgudi.oar.net!hypnos!voxbox!  
jgrubs@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: ARRL Replies to proposed rules on Vanity Calls  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----

pat.wilson@pplace.com (Pat Wilson) writes:

> Is it just me, (what an opening, huh) or is no-one else against the  
> changes the ARRL wants to make in the Vanity Call proposal?  
>  
> How the heck did they come up with their ideas. 25 calls, not 10,  
> families can get calls of dead relatives (jezzzzzz, what kinda stuff is  
> this?), clubs get first shot at calls. I can't believe I haven't seen  
> some backlash from this stuff.  
>  
>

> 1. Calls belong to individuals, not as heirlooms to be willed down the  
> line of breeding.

This was done from time to time long ago on a Commission rule  
waiver basis.

> 2. Clubs should get in line, just like anyone else to receive calls,  
> not get special dispensation. They are no better, nor worse than  
> anyone individual. The MAN makes the call, not the CALL making the  
> man (club).

I see no harm in letting clubs recover expired club calls.

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----

Version: 2.6

iQCVAwUBLe53vDDUWq8RWEeNAQE1SgQAjB1it6GuSdKKI6NvgzLIevxgFFhIIId+/  
7BvGN/3xS7yc+K11Kw6ZGJU0QamxXY1DCV6L0qEhdgY3RcDUy7pU7qBZLEmfZ7Qx  
9Awpw74/HhZoCJvd7dM+ULsoHghdDXHHPqle5G4ooxuMA5i//vRiu8w82fJzqIoJ  
qHpbKIBwLgg=  
=WhE7

-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

```
+-----+
|           I am Homer of Borg.  Prepare to be...00oooooo!  Donuts!!!           |
| Jim Grubs, W8GRT                Voxbox Enterprises      THIS SPACE FOR RENT      |
| jgrubs@voxbox.norden1.com        6817 Maplewood Ave.    RATES REASONABLE        |
| Fido: 1:234/1.0                 Sylvania, Ohio 43560   Home: 419/882-2697        |
|           AMATEUR RADIO - The National Park of the Mind                       |
+-----+
```

-----  
Date: Fri, 03 Jun 94 04:04:52 GMT

From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!library.ucla.edu!csulb.edu!csus.edu!netcom.com!netcomsv!  
skyld!jangus@network.ucsd.edu

Subject: Coordination

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

A few years back, the FCC announced that the 220 MHz amateur band will  
shrink a few MHz.

So.... the local coordinating body for 220 (220SMA in Southern Calif.)  
went through the effort of attempting to determine a new band plan.

I suggested a lottery to reassign ALL of the repeater pairs. This was  
not received too well. My point being that the FCC could have just as

well taken the top or middle 2 MHz of the band. And that EVERYONE should have a fair chance at getting what was left. If they wanted to get tricky, a weighting scheme (like first draft, second draft etc.) could have been arranged to give priority to those that have had the longest continuous coordination or largest user groups.

Interestingly enough, the attitude of those that were the most vocal was the repeater owners in the lower portion of the band. 222-223 MHz. Apparently their attitude was that; 'We're here, and we're not moving, so go stuff your bandplan.'

Several plans were proposed but in the final tally almost the entire band was devoted to repeater operation.

This was not well received by the "other mode" users of the 220 Band. The net result was yet another band planing meeting, an action by the FCC to state mode sub-bands and a still pending final decision of what to do with 220. Now there is also the planning spectre of the 212-219 MHz band for point to point.

What's the point? Well, it appears that as a group amateurs can NOT reach ANY kind of a consensus on ANYTHING. And the result is that the FCC has to be brought in to settle who gets to play in the sand box and with which toys. As usual, we're not going to like the results. But then I doubt that we'll be able to agree on anything before it's too late either.

Things need to be resolved about morse code proficiency, technical awareness, and the priorities of users and various modes on the available spectrum. It would help if we could do more than just find fault with every one/thing/else.

Just a thought....

73

Jeff

Amateur: WA6FWI@WA6FWI.#SOCA.CA.USA.NOAM	"You have a flair for adding
Internet: jangus@skyld.grendel.com	a fanciful dimension to any
US Mail: PO Box 4425 Carson, CA 90749	story."
Phone: 1 (310) 324-6080	Peking Noodle Co.

Hate "Green Card Lottery"? Want to help curb ignorant crossposting on Usenet?  
E-mail ckeroack@hamp.hampshire.edu for more information, or read news.groups.

-----  
Date: Thu, 02 Jun 94 20:30:16 EDT  
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!  
ns.mcs.kent.edu!kira.cc.uakron.edu!malgudi.oar.net!hypnos!voxbox!

jgrubs@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: Legal Protections for Hams  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----

jhanson@yar.cs.wisc.edu (Jason Hanson) writes:

> Ideas I have so far include:  
>  
> 1) Opposition to scanner/radio bans, etc.  
> 2) Adoption of PRB-1 (with possible revisions) into statutory form (I know  
> about federal preemption, but this would make cases easier for hams...)  
> 3) Developing stronger partnerships between state and ARES/RACES, etc.

How about doing something about restrictive covenants?

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----

Version: 2.6

iQCVAwUBLe56ATDUWq8RWEeNAQE17wP8CxynRCVwbFUUhvbmeaVs/k5ZigT/TuTq  
ykpPvFXqdQjvu20/31V/YpoDV+8sbuxoH2eydlwU0wCJyBYbt/db6/lv+Ma0rp8X  
p/M4BlS YinUWdviVGG1pYAXWoXhaqRIpkSi+6ZRbAmEWicvHU644LyE791AIP9k3  
F+BNH9iyxUA=  
=NIie

-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

```
+-----+
|           I am Homer of Borg.   Prepare to be...00oooooo!  Donuts!!!           |
| Jim Grubs, W8GRT                 Voxbox Enterprises    THIS SPACE FOR RENT      |
| jgrubs@voxbox.norden1.com        6817 Maplewood Ave.   RATES REASONABLE        |
| Fido: 1:234/1.0                  Sylvania, Ohio 43560  Home: 419/882-2697      |
|           AMATEUR RADIO - The National Park of the Mind                       |
+-----+
```

-----  
Date: 2 Jun 1994 16:22:40 -0600  
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!howland.reston.ans.net!spool.mu.edu!  
mnemosyne.cs.du.edu!nyx10.cs.du.edu!not-for-mail@network.ucsd.edu  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1994Jun1.221408.20183@newsgate.sps.mot.com>,  
<2sjcnj\$beg@agate.berkeley.edu>, <1994Jun2.161309.5649@newsgate.sps.mot.com>, ±  
Subject : Re: 440 in So. Cal.

In article <1994Jun2.161309.5649@newsgate.sps.mot.com>,

Dave Kinzer <kinzer@dtsdev0.sps.mot.com> wrote:

>Random

>monitoring throughout the year could determine the least used, say,

>five percent of the pairs, and yank them to be put up for lottery.

That's right; never mind that they've invested thousands of dollars and thousands of manhours in making their system; just yank the rug out from under them. Oh, yes: you've completely forgotten special-use machines that don't see a lot of use in normal times, but under certain circumstances - say, a disaster - are essential parts of a communications system, never mind the experimental systems that support modes the average ham has no interest in.

> Once again, these schemes are only needed where demand exceeds supply.

>The groups that have had the coordination over the years continue to

>threaten the coordinating body to keep them, but there will come a

>time when some group or groups who want to put up a repeater are going

>to sue the coordinating body out of existence. Then, anarchy will reign.

What makes you think that that would succeed? There's one key advantage of the current system: it's legally bulletproof, as it's based completely on objective, independently verifiable fact. No redistribution scheme shares that attribute. Further, there's lots of spectrum available for folks who don't currently have a machine up - and that would help populate other bands, which I think we all would agree is a Good Thing.

As a director of a coordinating body, I can assure you that no scheme that changes the rules in the middle and decoordinates trustees that have followed the rules as they were will be voluntarily adopted, at least in my organization - and, I suspect, others as well. The risks are too high, and the return too small.

>This is not a good thing for anybody. A procedure should be in  
>place to allow a peaceful transition of little used pairs to better  
>use.

There is, IF THE TRUSTEE AGREES TO GIVE UP HIS COORDINATION. Anything else is downright theft.

> Note that nowhere in here do I think that the closed repeater  
>groups should have a secondary stake in this. If a closed group is  
>making good use of the frequencies, that is perfectly fine. Of course,  
>if they are not (or an open repeater is not,) it is time for someone  
>else to take over.

Define "good use" in a way that makes no value judgment and is completely objective and independently verifiable.

> I don't live in so cal either, but I would like to see this resolved

>in an intelligent manner, as this will eventually be a problem for  
>other areas of the country.

The only problem is that folks can't put up yet another 2 meter yak box. Big, fat, hairy deal.

--

Jay Maynard, EMT-P, K5ZC, PP-ASEL | Never ascribe to malice that which can  
jmaynard@admin5.hsc.uth.tmc.edu | adequately be explained by stupidity.  
To Sarah Brady, Howard Metzenbaum, Dianne Feinstein, and Charles Schumer:  
Thanks. Without you, I would be neither a gun owner nor an NRA life member.

-----  
Date: 3 Jun 1994 10:27:48 +0300  
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!pipex!sunic!news.funet.fi!  
news.cc.tut.fi!proffa.cc.tut.fi!not-for-mail@network.ucsd.edu  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1994Jun1.140038.23814@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>, <hamilton.770500266@BIX.com>,  
<np2xCqr7Jx.5L2@netcom.com>fi  
Subject : Re: Code test speeds

Phil Petersen (np2x@netcom.com) wrote:

> The only purpose that I can see in keeping the code requirement in  
>place is to keep a few hundred thousand other people off of bands where  
>there isn't enough room (spectrum) for the people that are now on HF. Our  
>available spectrum is an inalienable fact of Mother Nature (God?) and our  
>Congress. There isn't enough of it to go around to everybody.

The current HF users have managed to fill up all available bands and no doubt they could fill the whole 1-30 MHz range if it would be available to radio amateurs. The largest culprits to this situation are the contest organizers who arrange contest every weekend and the sponsors of country collecting awards (notably ARRL DXCC) with a multitude of combinations. The problem with contesting and DXing is that it is usually done at maximum available transmitter power and worldwide frequency reuse is not an issue.

By promoting ways of operation that do not require the use of maximum available power, much more frequency reuse can exist. QRP and forms of communication that can be done by a single hop (and thus lower power) should be promoted.

On the technical side, systems that have automatic (nearly) realtime two-way power control should be used. A simple example is the AMTOR system described in QST a year ago, where the transmitted power level

is controlled by the number of retransmissions required. Such systems will prevent your signal from spreading to far away and thus enhance world wide frequency reuse.

Even if the regulations call for minimum power to carry out the communication, it is in the human nature to prefer high signal to noise ratios at the receiving end and too much power is used at the transmitter. Thus the power level control should be automatic and not manual. In digital communication systems (in AMTOR and more advanced systems) this is quite easy to implement.

By such measures, more users will fit into the current HF bands.

Paul OH3LWR

-----  
Phone : +358-31-213 3657  
X.400 : G=Paul S=Keinanen O=Kotiposti A=ELISA C=FI  
Internet: Paul.Keinanen@Telebox.Mailnet.fi  
Telex : 58-100 1825 (ATTN: Keinanen Paul)  
Mail : Hameenpuisto 42 A 26  
FIN-33200 TAMPERE  
FINLAND

-----  
End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #235

\*\*\*\*\*